G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—20 12-18

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1902-03

~~191~~.

(Miscellaneous)

File No. 173

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Dismissal of Subbanna Murthy Gumasta & Subbanna Shroff in connection with the missing pearls of a pearl necklace deposited in the Taluk Treasury belonging to the Thirumood Gopalaswami Temple Mudlepet

PREVIOUS REFERENCES

LATER REFERENCES

Municipal Department

1902-0

Subject

Petition no 1089 dated 6th December 1902 from C. Vedachellum Sheriff of Gundlepet re

---

In dealing with the case regarding the missing of some of the Sri Kumara Swamy temple in the Gundlepet Taluk the petitioner was dismissed from the service (Vide Govt. Order no 829-39 dated 29th October 1902). But the order directed the dismissal of "Municipal Commissioner" Gundlepet. A printed copy of the order is put up.

The petitioner contends

that he had nothing to do with the Nuzvid work, that the Govt. order directed the dismissal of "Nuzvid Gumastah Subbanna and that it did not refer to him who is "Sheristh" Subbanna, but Board that the Dy Comm! however made it applicable to him. In the petition, he admits that in connection with this case, the Dy Comm! had, before the Govt order was passed, transferred him to Chamarajnagar Taluk as deputy tuhsildar on a reduced salary.

The records of the

local enquiries showed that there were two persons of the same name Sri Bhavani but one was the Deputy Gumasta doing Municipal work and the other the Sheriff's (the pet.). The charges were brought home to "Sheriff Subbanna" as the party concerned and not Mohamed Jaffer, Assistt Superintt of Police who conducted the enquiries clearly expressed as his opinion in his Remarks memo that "Sheriff Subbanna" was to be blamed. The Dy Commr was also of the same opinion as will be observed from his

4

letter printed in extenso

Subd to the Dewan

There seems to be no doubt that the person described in the Petn The Govt order may be excepted in that behalf and the Petnr informed accordingly

29/3/03

RD 30.3.03
9452

01023

It was Nilmini Mozoomdar Sorbhauma who in company with Sarbeliyar & under the Shemladen hoisted off the jewel and [illegible] sound - It is conduct was, on principle, against the Sarbeliyar & he was ordered the Shaheb dismissed - If the Dy Comr suspended Sorbhauma Shroff as well it was quite competent whom to dismiss him - & there no objection - This being so deal with - But further from onward it is not clear what sent this man actually work on the day the work charge of the jewel -

1.IV.03

Draft 3/4/03 Addl

Recd 3/4/03

5

Note continued:-

The Dewan's order dated 1st. April 1903 (endorsed on page 1 of this Note) was issued in Govt. Pro. no 2144 Mus 729-93 dated 5th May 1903 wherein the Dy Commr was requested to report what part Shroff Subbanna actually took on the day the Sheristedar took charge of the jewel.

The Dy Commr reports (vide his letter no 38 of 21st August 1903) that Shroff Subbanna was on leave on the day when the charge was taken From the Amildar's report no 13 it is observed that Shroff Subbanna was on leave from the 5th Oct. 1901 up to 13th Nov. 1901 The charge in question was taken on the 17th Oct. 1901 when the Shroff was on leave

Submitted
Rs
31/8/03

P.T.O.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT:—

Punishment inflicted on those head- were concerned in the missing jewels case at Kunchipet.

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 81 dated 12th November 1903 from the Dy Commr, Mysore District.

There were 5 persons, reported to have been connected with this case — viz

(1) Shivalingu Nanjundaiah

(2) Ganapathiyar Timmalachar

(3) Muzrai Kannada Subhanna

(4) Shroff Subbanna —

(5) Amildar Mr Kunni Rao

In the Govt Proceedings No 829-30 dated 29th October 1902, the

Sundaram was examined, the
Shirastadar enquiry was
made liable to account for the
loss, and Parthasarathy Tirumalachar
and Ranganai Ramastu Subbarao
were directed to be dismissed.
No mention was made in his order
about Shroff Subbarao, but
the Dy Comrs, Mr Ramanujayyar
had however stated in his letter
that his private character was
reported to be not good
that his movements after the
discovery of the fraud had
been suspicious and that he
would therefore deal with him suitably.
On receipt of the Govt order,
Mr Ramanujayyar dismissed
Shroff Subbarao and not
Ranganai Ramastu Subbarao;
and the former therefore appealed
to Govt in December 1902, pointing
out that the Govt order had
was

was applicable to Murzai Ismail
Subhanna and not to him —
It was thereupon observed in
Govt Secy no 2144 dated 5th
May 1903, that Murzai Ismail
Subhanna's conduct was as
suspicious as that of the Par-
-kulayar, and that he was
intended and had been ordered,
by Govt to be dismissed. It was
further observed that if the
Dy Comr suspected Shrotr
Subhanna as well, it was
quite competent to him to dismiss
him, but that however, it was
not clear what part he said
Shrotr Subhanna actually
took on the day the Christians
took charge of the jewels.

2. In reply the Dy Comr states
that the Shrotr Subhanna

Letter no 38 dated
21st August 1903.

was on leave on the day in question.
cancel This communication was
disposed of by asking the Dy Comrs
whether Murugesa Gumasta Subbanna
had been dismissed, and enquiring
how the final orders passed
in the later proceedings regarding
Shroff Subbanna, were given
effect to.

Docket-no
684 dated
10th Sept. '03

3. With reference to the above,
the Offg Dy Comrs are hereby
this, in his present communication
states that an endorsement has
been granted to Shroff Subbanna
Head informing him that he cannot
be reinstated, and that orders
will be issued at once for the
removal of Murugesa Gumasta
Subbanna -

Submitted
Ks
3/1/04

Then I see that
Nothing further has
to be done
Sd
4/1/04

Note continued :—

R. Subbanna, Sheristadar of Devanur Hobli, Nanjangud Taluk has presented 2 petitions in which he says in connection with the orders passed in Govt. Pro: No 829 37, dt 29th Oct: 1902 that the observations made in para 3 of the said Pro: are all applicable to Sheriff Subbanna and not to him. He says that he assumed charge of the office of 2nd Examiner in the Gundlepet Taluk on the 18th June 1901 and that it was in October of the same year that Sheristedar Nanjund again took charge and that by that time the petr: was in the Taluk Office for only 4 months & that he was never before in service in the said Taluk. He states it was Sheriff Subbanna who was in the Taluk for about 4 or 5 years and was handling the jewels lodged in Treasury. He adds that he did not even

(6)

once handle the jewel until the Sheristedar Nanjundayya took charge, and that at that time, under the Sheristedar's orders he was reading out the list of the jewels and this being so, he represents that the observations that 'muzrai Gumaster Subbanna who 'was handling these jewels & who has not 'chosen to give or obtain information 'regarding the true origin of this case 'must be dismissed' are not applicable thin. To prove that he was new to the Taluk, he invites reference to the report of Mr. Ramanujiengar (Mem. Assistant) & to the certificate of Mr. V. N. Gurumurthy Naidu who testifies that "Dy Gumaster Subbanna is new to this Taluk & is not [illegible] true. But ever since [illegible] Taluk he has been working hard & intelligently. He is of good behaviour & very obedient. I hope he will rise in service". His certificate is dy 16th Oct. 1901. He petitioner prays that the punishment of dismissal inflicted on

on him may be obtained and the pe[illegible]
restored to some appointment.

Submitted

24/12/04

I regret to hear that the Petr
in this case is now dead.
File the Petn as no orders
are required Ld 29/8/05

29/8/05

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 29-12-02
REG. NO. 7089
MUZRAI BRANCH

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪಿಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂಡಿ 22-12-07

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: 1) ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದೇಶ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಪಿಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂಡಿ 29-ಪಿಆರ್ಪಿ-07 ದಿನಾಂಕ 18-12-07

2) ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಜ್ಞಾಪನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಪಿಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂಡಿ 22-12-07 ದಿನಾಂಕ 18-12-07

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಜ್ಞಾಪನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಪ್ಪ ಇವರನ್ನು ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಂದ್ರಪ್ಪ ಇವರು ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ಸಹಿ ಪಡೆದು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/-

ಕಾರ್ಯಪಾಲಕ ಎಂಜಿನಿಯರ್

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಪ್ಪ ಇವರಿಂದ ಸಹಿ ಪಡೆದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/- 18-12-07

ಕಾರ್ಯಪಾಲಕ ಎಂಜಿನಿಯರ್

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವ ಆದೇಶವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಪ್ಪ ಇವರಿಂದ ಸಹಿ ಪಡೆದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/- 18-12-07

ಕಾರ್ಯಪಾಲಕ ಎಂಜಿನಿಯರ್

ಸಂ 35

ಸಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಇರುವ
ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನೇರ ನೇಮಕಾತಿ ಮೂಲಕ
ಭರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಿದೆ.
ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ 3-12-02ನೇ
ಸೋಮವಾರ ಸಂಜೆ 5.30 ಗಂಟೆ
ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ
ಸಂಜೆ 5.30 ಗಂಟೆಯೊಳಗೆ
ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು
ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ 1-12-02ನೇ ಭಾನುವಾರ

ಸಹಿ/-
ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

455

Murugan

Read:-

Para 3 of Govt. Pro. No. 827 34 Mun 7 24-93

dated 29th October 1902,

directing the dismissal

of Subbanna, Murugan

Gumasta of the Gundlupet

Taluk in the matter

of the missing pearls &c

of a ~~pearl~~ pearl necklace

(deposited in the Taluk

Treasury) belonging to

the Sri Kumaraswamy

temple.

And, Petition No. 1089

dated 22nd December 1902

from Subbanna, Accountant

of the Govt Pleader Taluk

stating that he had nothing

to do with the municipal

work, that the Govt.

order read above directed

the dismissal of "Muzrai

Gumasta Subbanna"

and that it did not

refer to him who is.

"Shroff Subbanna";

but that the Dy Commr.

however made it applicable

to him and had before

the Govt. order was passed,

transferred him (the petr.)

to Channarajpatna

Taluk

(2)

rank as Deputy Munsif

on a reduced salary

No. 2144
Mun: F. 29-93

Dy 5. 5. 03.

Order thereon No. :—

The records of the local enquiry show that there were two persons going by the same name of "Subbanna", one of whom was the Deputy Gumasta doing Munsif work and the other was the Shroff (the petitioner, 2 It was "Munsif Gumasta Subbanna" who in company with the Parpatteyar of the

temple and under the
Sheristedar of the Taluk
passed off the jewel
in question as being
sound. His conduct
was as suspicious as
that of the Parpattegar
and he was intended to be
and has been ordered
by Govt. to be dismissed.
If the Dy Commissioner
suspected "Shroff Subbanna"
as well, it was quite
competent to him to
dismiss him and Govt
have no objection
to

(3)

to his being [illegible]

with [illegible]

should be informed

by the Dy Commr accordingly

by endorsement.

3. The Govt however observe that from the papers on record it is not clear what part Shroff Subbanna actually took on the day the Sheristadar took charge of the jewel. This should be reported upon by Govt.

To, The Dy Commissioner Mysore Dt.

Dewans Order

4/5/03

4/5/03

Dy Secretary Revenue Dept

(General Serial No. 50)

~~189~~ 1903

From The Deputy [illegible]
Mysore & [illegible].

To The Deputy Secretary to Government, Revenue Secretariat, Bangalore.

Dated 21st Aug 1903.

Despatched

Received

General No. 34 } 189
No.

Enclosures No. One

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
259
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

24/8/03

Report by H. ab. H. Sh.

Mr Channa was on leave on the day on which Shanmukaswamy Nanjundia took charge of the jewel from Md. Ghani Rao, Amildar.

Ask D'Souza whether Marpai Gumasta Subbannah has been dismissed as per printed orders of 29th Oct 1902

As regards Shroff Subbanna say that Govt have already passed final orders in the letter No of 5/5/03 and request him to report for the info of Govt how the matter is finally disposed of by him—

5/9/03

He

Jail Press, Bangalore.—1-7-98.—7,502.

Deputy Commissioner's office
Mysore district
Muzrai Department
Dated Mysore 21st August 1903.

From

M. Kantaraj Urs Esq, BA.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore district.

To

L. Anantasami Rao Esq BA
Deputy Secretary to Government
Muzrai Department

Sir,

Adverting to para 3 of Government Proceedings No. 2144 dated 5th May 1903, MUZ No. 29-93 I have the honor to submit herewith the Gundlepet Amildar's report No. 13, dated 1st August 1903, from which it will be observed that Shroff Subbanna was on leave on the day on which Sheristadar Nanjundayya took charge of the jewel from Mr. Guru Rao Amildar.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

M Kantaraj Urs

for Deputy Commissioner
Mysore district

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

19 —19

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Deputy Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Commr
Mysore

Dated 10 Sept 1903

Despatched

Received

General No. 566
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

His letter no 38 dated 21st August 1903, reporting that Shroff Subbanna was on leave on the day on which the Sheristedar Nanjundayya took charge of the jewels belonging to the Sri Hiranadsopalaswamy temple from Amildar Mr Guru Rao

---

Write reference to the

above, has the honor to
enquire whether Murugan
Gunasta Subbamma
has been dismissed as per
orders conveyed in Govt.
Ro: No. 829-39 / Mur 729-93 dated
29th October 1902.

2. As regards Shri A
Subbamma ~~it is to be stated~~ Objection
that Govt. have already
passed final orders
in the taken Proceedings
No. 2144 / Mur 729-93 dated 5th May 1903;
and the Dy Commr is requested
to report for the information
of Govt. how the matter has
been finally disposed of by him.

3 The ~~Paper~~ enclosure is
retd

By order

Dy Secy
Mur Dept

Ds
7/9/03

1903 - 1904

621.

FROM The Deputy Commissioner
Impure District

To The Deputy Secretary
to Government of Bengal
Mungpoi Department

Dated 31st October 1903

Despatched 12.11.

Received

General No. 81
No.

Enclosure No.

Rupees
Rs
16/11/03

See Office Note
Feb. 4/1/04

Reporting on the disposal of Mungpoi Jungle Tobbacco as directed in Govt Pro. No. 829-39 dated 29.9.03 29th October 1902. —

Deputy Commissioner's Office

Mysore District

Muzrai Department.

Dated Mysore October 1903

From

M. Kantaraj Urs Esq, B.A.

Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District.

To

L. Anantasami Rao Esq, B.A.

Deputy Secretary to Government

Muzrai Department

Sir,

Adverting to your correspondence ending with your docket No. 684/29-93 dated 10th September 1903 in re the dismissal of Muzrai Gumasta Subbanna as directed in Government Proceedings No. 829-39/29-93 dated 29th October 1902, I have the honor to state that Mr. Ramanujiengar the then Deputy Commissioner for reasons which could not now be explained, dismissed Shroff Subbanna instead of Muzrai Gumasta Subbanna and

Subsequently transferred the latter Nanjangud Taluk as acting Shekdar This was perhaps done by him for reasons stated in paras 6 and 9 of his report to Government, No 262 dated 13th March 1902 in connection with his suspension of the repairs of the jewel in Mr. Guru Rao's house and his being entrusted with the Key of the muzrai jewel box by the latter. As Government has no objection for his removal from service under such suspicious circumstances (See Proceedings No 2144 / Jud 3.7 29-93 dated 5th May 1903) I cannot now recommend his reinstatement. An endorsement to this effect has been granted to Shroff Subbanna as required by Government.

As regards Muzrai Gumasta Subbanna who was present at the time of Shersta-dar Nanjundiah taking charge of the jewels and whose and old Parupattegar Trimalachar's representations, the said Sheristadar "did not even take the trouble of

verifying. I think he ought to have been dismissed from service at once as directed by Government, in Proceedings No. 829-39/29-93 dated 29th October 1902. Instead of this he seems to have been transferred to the Nanjangud Taluk as Shekdar on promotion evidently on the suppression of facts, and there is no record to show the justification of this action and orders will therefore be issued at once for his removal also from service.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Illegible
for Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
2780.
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

It is clear from the Dewan's order that this petitioner and no other person was treated as an undoubtedly accordingly

This
26/5/04

Q.

Endorsement granted to V. R. Subbanna, late Munzrai Gumastah of the Gundlepet Taluk, now residing at Periapatna, Hunsur Taluk, with reference to his petn Regd No 2780, dated 8th May 1904, praying to be reinstalled in his former post.

In reply, the petr is informed that orders having been finally passed in ~~Govt~~ Pro. No 2144, of the 5th May 1903, Govt see no reason to reconsider the question.

No. 3743 D 30/5/04
M. 7. 29-1893

By order,

Bangalore, 7 May 1904

2715

Offg Munz: Secretary

ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ ಪರಮಹಂಸ ಪರಿವ್ರಾಜಕಾಚಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ೧೦೮ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಶ್ವೇಶತೀರ್ಥ ಶ್ರೀಪಾದಂಗಳವರ ಪರಮಾನುಗ್ರಹ ಸಂದೇಶ

ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ ಪರಮಹಂಸ ಪರಿವ್ರಾಜಕಾಚಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ೧೦೮ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಶ್ವೇಶತೀರ್ಥ ಶ್ರೀಪಾದಂಗಳವರ ಪರಮಾನುಗ್ರಹ ಸಂದೇಶ

ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ ಪರಮಹಂಸ ಪರಿವ್ರಾಜಕಾಚಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ೧೦೮ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಶ್ವೇಶತೀರ್ಥ ಶ್ರೀಪಾದಂಗಳವರ ಪರಮಾನುಗ್ರಹ ಸಂದೇಶ

ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ ಮಠದ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ ಪರಮಹಂಸ ಪರಿವ್ರಾಜಕಾಚಾರ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ೧೦೮ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿಶ್ವೇಶತೀರ್ಥ ಶ್ರೀಪಾದಂಗಳವರ ಪರಮಾನುಗ್ರಹ ಸಂದೇಶ

Dry gumastā Gulbanna is new to this Taluk and is not well known to me - But ever since he came to this Taluk he has been working hard and intelligently - He is of good behaviour and very obedient. I hope he will rise in life.

16/10/01

Signed
V V Gururao